

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are amended for clarification, and claims 14-28 are added. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**I. Information Disclosure Statement**

The Examiner is requested to consider the reference cited in the attached Information Disclosure Statement and return a fully initialed form PTO-1449 to Applicant's undersigned representative.

**II. Objection to the Specification**

The Office Action objects to the specification based on an informality.

The specification is amended to obviate the rejection by replacing "switch16" with "switch 16." Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**III. Objection to the Drawings**

The Office Action objects to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the reference sign "a CPU 102" used in the specification. The specification is amended to delete reference to "a CPU 102," obviating the objection. The specification also is amended to provide clarification with respect to the main CPU 102a and the blur correction CPU 102b. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Washisu, U.S. Patent No. 6,704,501. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Washisu fails to disclose or suggest a control unit that controls the blur correction drive unit in the blur correction disabled state so as to hold the blur correcting optical system at a specific position by supplying power at a specific time point in the blur correction

disabled state, and that stops supplying power to the blur correction drive unit in the blur correction disabled state so as to not hold the blur correcting optical system at any specific position, as recited in claim 1. Similarly, Washisu fails to disclose a control unit that holds the blur correcting optical system at an aligned position by supplying power at a specific time point, as recited in independent claim 6.

Washisu discloses that the position of the correction optical apparatus in the blur correction disabled state is held with a lock ring 719 (FIGS. 39, 44, 47A and 47B), not by the supplying of power. Any supplying of power to the pitch and yaw motors 1206 and 1210 (allegedly corresponding to the claimed blur correction drive unit) is stopped in the blur correction disabled state and the lock ring 719 holds the correction optical apparatus in a fixed position (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 42-44 and col. 8, lines 41-61). Because of the space required to accommodate the lock ring 719, Washisu cannot obtain the benefits of a more compact apparatus. Further, Washisu does not stop supplying power in the blur correction disabled state so as to not hold the correction optical apparatus at any specific position, as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Washisu fails to disclose or suggest holding the blur correcting optical system at a specific position in the disabled state by supplying power at a specific time point, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 6, and stopping the supply of power to the blur correction drive unit in the blur correction disabled state so as to not hold the blur correcting optical system at any specific position, as recited in claim 1. Thus, claims 1 and 6 are patentable over Washisu. Because claims 3-5 depend from claim 1, these claims also are patentable over Washisu. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**V. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claims 7, 8 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Washisu in view of Eto et al. (Eto), U.S. Patent No. 7,113,204. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Eto fails to overcome the deficiencies of Washisu with respect to independent claims 1 and 6. Because claims 7, 8 and 10-12 depend from claim 1 and claim 13 depends from claim 6, these dependent claims also are patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**VI. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Maeno, U.S. Patent No. 5,084,724. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Maeno fails to disclose or suggest a control unit that controls the blur correction drive unit in the blur correction disabled state so as to hold the blur correcting optical system at a specific position by supplying power at a specific time point in the blur correction disabled state, and that stops supplying power to the blur correction drive unit in the blur correction disabled state so as to not hold the blur correcting optical system at any specific position, as recited in claim 1.

Maeno discloses that the position of the optical system in the blur correction disabled state is held with a support frame 3 (FIG. 10), not with the supplying of power, as recited in claim 1. As acknowledged by the Examiner, "the support frame 3 of lens 2 is held back to a neutral position by the deflecting force of flexible rods 4 when vibration compensation is disabled by cutting electric current supply to the coils." Thus, when the supplying of power to the unit allegedly corresponding to the claimed blur correction drive unit is stopped in the blur correction disabled state, the support frame 3 holds the optical system in a fixed position. Therefore Maeno fails to disclose or suggest the claim 1 control unit that controls the blur

correction drive unit in the blur correction disabled state so as to hold the blur correcting optical system at a specific position by supplying power at a specific time point, as recited in independent claim 1.

Further, Maeno does not stop supplying power in the blur correction disabled state so as to not hold the optical system at any specific position, as also recited in claim 1.

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Maeno. Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and thus also is patentable over Maeno. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**VII. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Maeno in view of Eto. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Eto fails to overcome the deficiencies of Maeno with respect to independent claim 1. Because claim 9 depends from claim 1, claim 9 also is patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**VIII. Added Claims**

Added claims 14-28 also are patentable over the applied references.

**IX. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,565

David R. Kemeny  
Registration No. 57,241

MAC:DRK/kxs

**Attachments:**

Petition for Extension of Time  
Information Disclosure Statement  
Amendment Transmittal

Date: June 8, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---